



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,167	06/08/2000	Brendan Larder	07691.0006	9773

27777 7590 03/24/2005

PHILIP S. JOHNSON  
JOHNSON & JOHNSON  
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA  
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER

CLOW, LORI A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/589,167

Applicant(s)

LARDER ET AL.

Examiner

Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 18 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants' arguments, filed 13 December 2004, have been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 13, 18, and 19 are currently pending.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

Art Unit: 1631

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 13, 18, and 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ioannidis et al. (American Journal of epidemiology (1998) Vol. 147, No. 5, pages 464-471), in view of Harrigan et al. (AIDS (1999) Vol. 13, No. 14 , pages 1863-1871), for the reason stated in the previous Office Action.

### **Response to Applicant's Arguments**

1) Applicant argues that Harrigan et al. “make actual correlations of genotypes and/or phenotypes with clinical response, expressed in logarithmic viral load values (copies of RNA per mL). To achieve this correlation, Harrigan et al. employ a univariate and multivariate logistic regression. The approach by Harrigan et al. is further limited in that it predicts clinical response on the administration of ritonavir and saquinavir only, which are both protease inhibitors. Conversely, the present invention is able to predict resistance.” Applicant goes on to discuss definitions of “resistance” as indicated by the web site [www.aids.org](http://www.aids.org). Applicant further states that Harrigan et al. teach “correlating genotypic and/or phenotypic resistance with clinical resistance”, as defined by the definitions provided in the response by Applicant. Applicant states that “Ioannidis et al, on the other hand, correlates HLA genotypic sequences with clinical resistance, expressed as 0 (no disease progression to AIDS within 6 years) or 1 (disease progression to AIDS within 6 years)”. Lastly, Applicant states that “on the provision of a computational tool that can recognize complex genetic patterns of resistance within the drug

Art Unit: 1631

dimension, Ioannidis et al. and Harrigan et al. are completely silent and therefore one of skill in the art would not be able to recognize the alleged technical problem starting from the disclosure of any one of the prior art documents”.

These arguments are not found persuasive. First, Applicant contends that Harrigan et al. do not teach phenotypic resistance and points to definitions in which to base this argument. However, Harrigan et al. clearly teach phenotypic resistance, as was emphasized in the previous Office Action. Further, as is seen in Figure 3, baseline drug resistance phenotype is taught (saquinavir resistance). Applicant’s definitions do not limit the claims, as these definitions are not reflected in the specification as originally filed. The definitions provided in the specification regarding resistance do not exclude clinical resistance and there is nothing in the claims that so limits resistance.

Lastly, Applicant argues that the present invention is a computational tool. However, the claims are not directed to a computational tool. Furthermore, the combination of Ioannidis et al. and Harrigan et al. teach a tool in which resistance of HIV to therapeutic agents using a neural network can be measured.

2) Applicant argues that “a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established, at least because there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the references”. This is not found persuasive. In fact, Applicant admits on page 5, line 27, that “the Examiner points to the motivation to use a neural network...” The previous Office Action clearly outlined the motivation to combine the references of Ioannidis et al. and Harrigan et al. The motivation is reiterated herein, for Applicant’s convenience: “it would have been prima facie obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the neural network of Ioannidis et al. for the

Art Unit: 1631

assessment of predicting drug resistance of HIV, as is done by Harrigan et al. The motivation to use a neural network is provided in the statement by Ioannidis et al., which says, “neural networks could be trained to recognize genetic patterns in conjunction with associated clinical outcomes, and their performance in modeling these complex associations in a training set was superior to logistic regression models (page 469, column 1)”. Harrigan et al. use logistic regression in their assessment of baseline resistance, however, it would have been obvious to improve the accuracy of the resistance testing by using the neural network of Ioannidis et al. for the reasons set forth above.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

No claims are allowed.

### **Inquiries**

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The

Art Unit: 1631

faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central Fax Center Number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori A. Clow, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0715. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

March 16, 2005  
Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.  
Art Unit 1631  
*Lori A. Clow*

MARJORIE A. MORAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Marjorie A. Moran*  
3/16/05